

**CITY OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2003
KIVA - City Hall
3939 Drinkwater Boulevard, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251**

Present: Brian Davis, Commissioner
Mark Gilliland, Vice-Chair
David Hill, Commissioner
Vivian Johnson, Commissioner
Mark Melnychenko, Chairman
John Rooney, Commissioner
Jeffrey Schwartz, Commissioner

Staff Present: Rose Arballo
Debbie Astin
Phil Kercher
Michelle Korf
Fran LaPrairie
John Little
Janet Secor

Others Present: Rick Kidder, City of Scottsdale Chamber of Commerce

Commissioner Vivian Johnson called the Regular Meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 16, 2003

COMMISSIONER HILL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION STUDY SESSION AND REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 16, 2003. COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

(Commissioner Rooney joined the Commission meeting at 6:22 p.m. and was not present to vote for this agenda item.)

ELECTION OF TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON MOTIONED TO NOMINATE VICE-CHAIR HILL FOR CHAIRMAN. VICE-CHAIR HILL DECLINED AND MOTIONED TO NOMINATE COMMISSIONER MELNYCHENKO FOR CHAIRMAN OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION. COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

COMMISSIONER HILL NOMINATED COMMISSIONER GILLILAND FOR VICE-CHAIR OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION. CHAIRMAN MELNYCHENKO SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

(Commissioner Rooney was not present to vote for this agenda item as he joined the Commission meeting at 6:22 p.m.)

ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION

Mr. Kidder presented the Scottsdale Chamber of Commerce's thoughts and ideas of the role transportation can play in downtown and south Scottsdale revitalization. Mr. Kidder explained that transportation plays an important role in Scottsdale due to the city being a:

Net importer of the work force. Mr. Kidder stated that 50% of the people who work in Scottsdale reside elsewhere which contributes to the city's transportation system being overcrowded. It is also believed that the lack of affordable housing and limited transportation options result in a challenge for Scottsdale's employers.

Tourist destination. The ability to move tourists in and around Scottsdale is also a challenge. Focus needs to be made on this in an attempt to get tourists to move throughout the city and generate tax revenues.

Livable city: It is recognized that the city as an organization cannot solely be oriented to business. Issues have arisen regarding quality of life. Surveys of businesses reflect that 78% of the people who moved their companies to the Airpark did it so they could live in Scottsdale. It is believed that if situations in Scottsdale regarding transportation and other issues start deteriorating to the point where Scottsdale becomes a less attractive place to live, it will also become a less attractive place to draw business.

Mr. Kidder also explained that transportation in itself is an economic driver for the city. As new freeway improvements are made, new traffic patterns of transportation cause unintended consequences. Currently, freeway exits and signage are not drawing people into the southern part of Scottsdale. Due to shopping malls and clusters of car dealerships being built along the freeway for easy access, people no longer consider shopping at Fashion Square Mall, car dealerships on McDowell, or downtown. Mr. Kidder commented that the Chamber is pleased to see the DMB proposal for the Stacked 40's project approved, as this will be a positive economic engine the freeway will help make happen.

Mr. Kidder commented that when cities create incentives or disincentives, they sometimes promote people getting into their cars rather than getting out of their cars. One example in Scottsdale is the ordinance to allow free parking.

Current issues have arisen concerning the trolley. The downtown trolley really helps, but ways to get more funding for this system need to be sought. Even though ridership is low and the cost per rider is high, the trolley distinguishes the heart of Scottsdale from other parts of the city and becomes part of the identity of downtown. The Chamber wishes to get the Commission's support to put a trolley stop at the future site of the Visitor Center at the Galleria.

Mr. Kidder also stated that transportation requires some social engineering. The Chamber believes that incentives and disincentives need to be provided to drivers to try to get people out of their cars. Mr. Kidder mentioned that the County, ADOT, and the legislature have tried to do this by putting HOV lanes on highways, but does not seem to work. It appears that disincentives are more powerful motivators than incentives. The Chamber hopes to work with city staff on focusing on disincentives, signage and pedestrian flow in the downtown area as part of the revitalization process.

The Chamber feels that a case needs to be developed for transportation as key to development of the Scottsdale work force, tourism, and as an economic driver. Mr. Kidder stated that the Chamber stands ready to assist the Transportation Commission and the City to help make this happen.

Commissioner Rooney asked for the Chamber's view on charging for parking downtown.

Mr. Kidder stated that one perspective is a type of social engineering geared towards getting people out of their vehicles. Another perspective is that doing this could be met with resistance by drivers. Mr. Kidder suggested the question should be re-phrased to ask what the Chamber would do about parking elsewhere and making downtown a free parking zone. This will possibly be more powerful in drivers being less resistant.

Commissioner Hill expressed his interest on the issues of parking, transportation, and transit relative to the work force development in Scottsdale and the Airpark. He encourages more interaction between the Commission and the Chamber.

Commissioner Johnson asked Mr. Little if the signs on the freeway are mandated by ADOT and if the city can provide input on what signs should read. Mr. Little answered that ADOT controls all signage in the ADOT right-of-way of the freeway. However, the city has been successful in getting additional signage that identifies areas of community and cultural interest.

Commissioner Johnson suggested that focusing on signage might be a start in revitalizing the downtown area. She suggested that signage be installed on the freeway indicating to travelers that shopping services, galleries, Fashion Square Mall, etc., are accessible in the core of downtown Scottsdale. Mr. Kidder agreed.

Commissioner Schwartz added that he would like to hear continued discussions between the Commission and staff. The purpose is to understand the importance of issues that arise regarding access points to downtown where motorists may not understand the importance of leaving thoroughfares to go downtown (i.e., Thomas Road, Indian School, Chaparral).

Relative to the amount of signage on the highway, Vice-Chair Gilliland believes that ADOT is not very flexible. They are particular about the spacing and amount of information that is shown on signs. Vice-Chair Gilliland believes the city could do more on the existing rights-of-way, sign ordinances, and intersection improvements. He feels the addition of second left turn lanes, traffic interaction with adjacent Pima Roads, entry features, or signage ordinance regulations could help with the issue of drawing people off the Loop 101 by making it easier to get on or off the freeway. With regard to the freeway being an economic engine and the primary focus being on redevelopment of central and south Scottsdale, it is projected that the lack of this type of economic engine will affect the communities in north Scottsdale in the next 20-40 years. Mr. Kidder commented that Cave Creek and Carefree are distinctively different, but similar communities. It appears that these communities in the long term will also not be able to sustain a substantial economic growth without close access to transportation corridors.

Mr. Little added that city staff is interested in continually working with the Scottsdale Chamber and downtown businesses on revitalization issues. Ms. Korf has met with the Chamber and City Council to discuss signage and east/west routes in an attempt to draw people into the core of the community.

TRANSIT: HOW WE MEASURE PERFORMANCE

Ms. Astin gave a presentation on how transit is measured, monitored and evaluated. She also gave a brief overview of the handout distributed to the Commission in their packets. Ms. Astin mentioned that before service is put in place, planning data is collected, measures are taken, and standards are created for efficiency and effectiveness of each particular route.

It was mentioned that once a service is put in place, data is again collected and monitored. Data is collected and compared to local and national benchmarks as to the time of year, time of day, trip, etc., to determine if a particular route is operating the way it should and why it is operating the way it is. Although there is a performance measure and performance standard, there are times when the lower cost per passenger or lower performance needs to be accepted on a particular route because it serves a need that cannot be served any other way. The performance measures most often used in the valley are cost per passenger (which is an efficiency measure) and a passenger per miles (which is an effectiveness measure).

Phoenix, as the largest city in the valley, carries the bulk of transit and that transit system has been in existence longer than any other city. Tempe has invested heavily in their transit system and like Phoenix has a large number of boardings. Even though bus ridership has continued to grow in Scottsdale, Ms. Astin pointed out that Scottsdale is a suburban city and will never operate like Phoenix or Tempe.

Ms. Astin stated it is staffs' goal to keep the cost per trip of the Cab Connection and TRIP programs to $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ of the cost of Dial-a-Ride in an effort to stabilize the transit budget. It is also staffs' effort to try to increase ridership on the Scottsdale trolley system.

Ms. Astin mentioned that people question why Scottsdale is running empty buses. She explained that there are times when it is appropriate for an empty bus to be on the road. This is mostly likely due to the bus going from the garage to the first point of service; or moving from the last point of service back to the garage; or it is between the two ends of the route; therefore, the bus is not in service and it is not intended to be carrying anyone at that point.

Ms. Astin closed her presentation by stating that transit is not about numbers, it is about people and making sure they are provided with a choice of transportation.

Commissioner Hill questioned the fourth column in the chart on page 18 of the handout. Ms. Astin confirmed that the statistics shown is for annual passenger miles of the particular routes listed, not annual passengers.

With regard to getting more people to ride the trolley, Commissioner Johnson asked Ms. Astin what plans are in place to ensure that more people will ride. Ms. Astin commented that ridership has increased 35% each year for the past two years. Ridership continues to increase as the economy improves. It is anticipated that ridership will increase significantly as soon as new vehicles are put on the road. Although staff is struggling with budget limitations and personnel resources, they will continue to work with the Chamber and Visitors and Conventions Bureau in an effort to market the trolley in the best way possible.

Commissioner Davis asked if Scottsdale could make fare changes to make the transit system more cost efficient. Ms. Astin commented that Scottsdale could charge a different fare, but has always tried to create a seamless service and has tried to maintain a fair system that is consistent around the valley. She explained that Scottsdale has control over routes in the city as to

frequency, span of service, etc., but does not have direct control over the cost of the contracts to provide services. Scottsdale, as a client of RPTA, Valley Metro and the City of Phoenix, can have staff sit in on review panels when procuring services. Ms. Astin stated that city staff has a good working relationship with other cities and all are helping each other in looking for ways to decrease costs.

Commissioner Rooney also questioned the chart on page 18 relating to funding for the cost per passenger and asked how much the city subsidizes each ride. Ms. Astin stated that the city receives state funds, federal funds, grants, etc. The amount shown on the chart on page 18 is the actual cost per passenger that comes out of these funds. These amounts do not come out of city funds alone.

Commissioner Rooney expressed his concern with the city's current budget in that the city is subsidizing routes that might not be the most cost effective routes. With regard to Mr. Kidder's comments that the trolley could help revitalize downtown, he feels that money may be spent on upgrading trolley service by having it run frequently and that it target the elderly or disabled. Commissioner Rooney commented he does not want to see the city spending unnecessary monies on a transit system when it could be targeted elsewhere.

Mr. Little commented that a decision package was presented to the City Council as part of the budget in January 2002. The purpose was for staff to get policy direction from the City Council to offer equivalent levels of transit service in Scottsdale as those offered by the neighboring communities. On February 25, department staff will go before the City Council to discuss how the current limited resources can be applied now and in the future to the maximum benefit of the community while maintaining control on cost, productivity, and efficiency. Staff anticipates making service adjustments to reflect today's economic reality.

Vice-Chair Gilliland understands there is a people perspective as to the types of transit service that should be available and believes that service needs to be consistent with the surrounding communities. He questions if there are measures that can predict or measure whether an increase is needed and if it is or is not cost effective. Ms. Astin stated there is no definitive answer to what the cost of transit should be. It is a community decision that has to be derived through Commissions, City Council, and citizen input. Ms. Astin stated that the February 25th City Council meeting will provide input and that staff will continue to look at reducing or eliminate services that are costly or can't be justified.

Vice-Chair Gilliland asked if the Cab Connection and TRIP programs are federally mandated like Dial-a-Ride. Ms. Astin answered no and that these are options that Scottsdale chooses to exercise.

Chairman Melnychenko referred to page 16 of the handout. Other than the onboard destination surveys completed by Valley Metro, Chairman Melnychenko asked if other outside surveys have been conducted to evaluate certain routes to determine if a change in route is needed. Ms. Astin stated that general satisfaction surveys, telephone surveys and focus group input are conducted as part of the on-board survey. Ms. Astin stated that surveys reflect 60%-80% of the riders have access to the Internet. She mentioned that riders would have the capability of connecting to the Internet within the next 12 months to plan their trips to determine which route is the shortest and less expensive.

BUDGET PROCESS UPDATE

Ms. Secor provided a brief update on the budget process relating to the capital plan that was adopted by the Transportation Commission in November 2002. This plan will be recommended to the City Council for adoption in June.

Ms. Secor pointed out that .2% privilege tax revenues are slow and that the city is at the approximate level of collection as in fiscal year 1999-2000. In addition, due to the decrease in general fund revenues, City planners will place more emphasis on how much it is going to cost to operate and maintain these projects. Ms. Secor reiterated that a specific project's being listed on the five-year capital budget does not guarantee it will be undertaken. The actual capacity of the city to deliver projects when they are planned is also being evaluated.

As one result of the constrained resources and the change in the capital budgeting process, two capital budgets have been created. One of these budgets, the recommended CIP, has good certainty that projects will be undertaken. The other, the "other identified needs" CIP, shows projects that are needed but are lower priority. The next steps in the budget adoption process that will culminate in June 2003 will be that the Citizens Budget Committee, the City Manager and Financial Services staff continue reviewing plans.

The Bond Commission that has been chartered to monitor the results of the Bond 2000 election will be asked to review and approve changes, and will forward them to the City Council on March 6. The Citizens Budget Committee has also been convened and in late March will review the operating and capital budgets. Public input for these two budgets will be sought on April 7 and April 21. The meeting on April 21st will be a policy discussion about the budget in which city staff and the City Council will review policy recommendations and changes relative to the budget.

Ms. Secor stated that although the budget process has changed in response to the changed operating environment, the outcome would not change. Staff will continue to build priority projects, maintain multi-modal emphasis in the Transportation capital plan, plan ahead 5-20 years, and will continue to monitor projects with citizens and Capital Project Management to ensure that projects are built.

Commissioner Rooney asked if the recommended budget that was approved in November 2002 has changed significantly. Ms. Secor stated it has not changed materially and that it is basically the same plan that was adopted in November with one or two exceptions where projects were delayed because of concerns about the operating budget impact. These exceptions are the expansion of the bus fleet and the addition of park and ride lots that affect the operating budget. Ms. Secor stated these are still being evaluated.

Commissioner Hill asked to see a copy of the current recommended budget for review. Ms. Secor will provide. Mr. Little added that the Bond Commission would meet on March 6 to discuss capital projects. Some of these projects are bond funded and some are funded out of the Capital Improvement Program. Mr. Little ensured that the Commission would be given the same materials that will be forwarded to the Bond Commission that shows what adjustments have been made in terms of projects that have been delayed and/or changed.

Due to the number of projects and short staffing in the city, Vice-Chair Gilliland asked what the management resource constraints might be. Ms. Secor commented that Capital Project Management staff can handle a defined number of projects, and that due to the large amount of projects, there could be a delay on a work plan as it comes forward. Priority projects will still get done. Mr. Little added that the workload is a factor of the planning process. As projects are scheduled, and due to the different nature of the projects and amount of public involvement, staff is constantly recalibrating the number of projects that can be managed. Projects need to be coordinated with Capital Project Management to ensure projects are designed and built within a reasonable time frame.

Vice-Chair Gilliland commented that since the citizens voted for the .2% sales tax for transportation projects, he believes that to maintain the public trust, they might like to see that accomplishments from those tax dollars have been made. If staffing is a constraint to get things done, Vice-Chair Gilliland believes it takes results to prove something has been done and that there are ways to supplement staff.

Relative to the Stacked 40s project, Chairman Melnychenko asked if the possibility of cutting back on a Park and Ride lot has been considered. Ms. Korf stated that a location study will be done to ascertain where a Park and Ride lot could best be located in order to possibly secure a remnant parcel that might come available from ADOT.

NOISE STUDY RESULTS

Mr. Little gave an update of the Michael Baker and Associates Noise Study, which is a three-phase noise-testing project of the freeway corridor in Scottsdale. The first phase has been completed, which consisted of measuring the noise generated from the freeway. Test Results showed that noise levels exceeded the ADOT standard of 64 decibels.

In response to Governor Hull's direction for ADOT to identify a source of funding to proceed with putting rubberized asphalt on 114 miles of urban freeway, ADOT anticipates to rubberize the southern part of the community in 2005-2006; Mountain View to Raintree in 2004; and Raintree to Scottsdale Road in 2006.

City officials are working closely with MAG and ADOT in an attempt to accelerate this schedule. This will involve working with ADOT to develop an Intergovernmental Agreement for payback in which the city of Scottsdale would advance funds and then be paid back the cost of rubberizing the roadway at a cost of approximately \$320,000 per mile.

Mr. Little stated that Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the study would move forward and he will provide an update on the continuing efforts of MAG and ADOT.

Commissioner Rooney asked if this study includes surface streets and if the city plans to look at particular streets where noise complaints have been made. Mr. Little stated that the study is only for the freeway and that there is no active plan to do noise monitoring on surface roads throughout the community.

Commissioner Johnson commented that staffs' efforts to provide and seek input from citizens proves the Transportation Department to be a model for what can be done and what will work for the community. She commended Mr. Little and staff on the successful series of public noise meetings that were held.

Commissioner Schwartz asked where the advanced monies for this project will come from and what areas of the city will be affected as a result of the monies being advanced. Mr. Little stated that staff has worked closely with Financial Services to ensure that a payback for advanced funds will happen in a timely manner. This will be explained in the IGA so that it will have no impact on any ongoing capital projects. The city does not want to advance funds if it will result in projects being delayed.

Chairman Melnychenko asked if the IGA would include maintenance of the rubberized asphalt. Mr. Little stated that an IGA has not been drafted at this time, but that ADOT is responsible for the installing the rubberized asphalt and will bear the maintenance cost.

Commissioner Davis asked what the amount of noise reduction and what the cost difference is between rubberized asphalt versus traditional asphalt. Mr. Little stated that research proves that rubberized asphalt placed on concrete results in a more effective sound reduction than if rubberized asphalt were placed on an older asphalt pavement. Therefore, putting rubberized asphalt on a concrete freeway will achieve the greatest mitigation. Mr. Little also mentioned that currently, the cost of rubberized asphalt can be as much as 50% more than standard asphalt. However, it is a law of supply and demand. As the demand for this product increases, the supply will also go up which will cause a leveling off of the price over time. Mr. Little commented that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is interested to know what the long-term life cycle of this product is and is interested in having the Valley of the Sun serve as a test site for rubberized asphalt. It is believed that if rubberized asphalt becomes an approved FHWA mitigation alternative, the possibility of federal funding may be available in the future.

IN-SERVICE: HOW SPEED LIMITS ARE DETERMINED

Mr. Kercher gave a presentation on the criteria the city uses to determine speed limits and the process used in making these decisions.

Mr. Kercher stated that the two main documents followed when determining speed limits are: (1) State statutes which provide the basic speed limit law that requires all drivers in Arizona drive at a speed reasonable and prudent for the existing conditions. This statute also sets maximum speed limits of 15 mph for school zones, 25 mph for business/residential districts, and 65 mph in all other locations; (2) Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) which states the posted speed limit should be the 85th percentile of free flowing traffic on roadways rounded up to the nearest 5 mph increments. It allows Traffic Engineering staff to consider other factors such as road characteristics, speed, parking, etc., when determining speed limits. The city also has Ordinance No. 2328, which allows the Transportation General Manager to alter speed limits as authorized under the state statute.

The criteria used to determine which streets are studied are based on: citizen requests, new streets, streets that have not been studied in the past 5 years, streets in areas that have significant traffic volume increases due to development, or streets that may have a high accident rate.

Mr. Kercher stated that some of the considerations used when determining speed limits are based on observations that have been validated by studies across the country. Decreasing a speed limit does not usually have much impact on travel speeds. Drivers are more influenced by the type of road and current conditions rather than by the posted speed limit. Setting an unreasonably low speed limit tends to result in a higher differential of travel speeds and unrealistic speed limits set arbitrarily low are sometimes difficult to enforce.

Commissioner Rooney commented that it is human nature for drivers to drive approximately 10 miles over the posted speed limit. People rely on the fact that police will not stop them unless they are 10 miles or more over the speed limit. Because of this, Commissioner Rooney feels it is a safety concern for the city in which it needs the ability to enforce speeding laws. Mr. Kercher commented that if the criteria of the 85th percentile speed were followed, higher speed limits would probably be set which may be

appropriate. For example, if the 85th percentile speed would be 55 mph through Grayhawk, staff would take into consideration the pedestrian activity, number of access points, and roadside development before an appropriate speed limit is set. Commissioner Hill questioned the status of decreasing speed limits on Pima Road. Mr. Little stated that staff is in the process of getting notification and postings made on Pima Road.

Chairman Melnychenko expressed the importance of designing streets in an attempt to mitigate speed. Mr. Kercher commented this has been a consideration. Over the past 10 years, there has been more of an effort to incorporate curves and geometric alignment changes to slow down vehicles. This is currently being done with traffic calming at residential streets in Scottsdale.

Commissioner Rooney expressed his concern that drivers continue to run red lights. He suggested the possibility of installing fake cameras at specific intersections to avoid red light running. Commissioner Rooney believes that spending some money on red light enforcement will possibly help bring speeds down.

COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Johnson thanked the Commissioners and staff for their courtesy and cooperation in helping her during her tenure as Chairperson.

Due to the budget crisis the city is currently in, Commissioner Rooney suggested the Commission brown bag dinner and that consideration be given to having Commission packets delivered via U.S. mail rather than by courier. Commissioner Rooney also suggested the possibility of e-mailing packet information to the Commissioners or providing the option of the Commissioners picking up packets at the Transportation Department.

Commissioner Johnson commented that the packets being delivered by U.S. mail would put a strain on staff. She does not feel the savings will amount to the inconvenience of more work having to be done by staff in having to get the packets out sooner than what they are now.

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Little expressed his gratitude to former Chairwoman Johnson.

Mr. Little commented that the issue of the delivery of packets will be reviewed to make sure staff is fiscally responsible. Mr. Little refused to not provide dinner for the Commission. He believes that this is the least the city can do for the quality time the Commissioners invest as officials of the Commission. Mr. Little mentioned that dinners will not be elaborate and will consist of pizza or box lunches to minimize expense.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Johnson motioned to adjourn the Regular meeting at 8:12 p.m. Commissioner Hill seconded the motion, which carried unanimously 6-0. (Commissioner Schwartz exited the meeting at 7:50 p.m. and was not present to vote for adjournment.)

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Arballo
Transportation Secretary